



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Se

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,033	03/12/2004	Ivan W. Pulleyn	29795/10000A	6705
4743	7590	04/22/2005	EXAMINER	
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606			LIN, KENNY S	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2154		

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,033	PULLEYN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenny Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-69 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-69 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13-18, 36-41 and 59-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema, WO 99/27680, in view of Belzile, US 6,801,952.

4. As per claims 13, 36 and 59, Huitema taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method of providing an IP address for a host in a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

- a. A processor (local computer is known to comprise processors) configured to: receiving a request for an IP address associated with a domain name from a client in a computer network (page 1, lines 19-21, page 2, lines 5-6);
- b. Retrieving the requested IP address from a database (page 1, lines 28-33, page 2, lines 5-8, 20); and
- c. Transmitting the retrieved IP address to the client (page 2, lines 5-8); and

d. A memory coupled with the processor, wherein the memory provides the processor with instructions (local computer is known to comprises memory to providing instructions).

5. Huitema did not specifically teach that the database is an object oriented database. Belzile taught to store IP address in object oriented database (col.5, lines 32-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema and Belzile and use an object oriented database as the database disclosed in Huitema's system to store and retrieve IP address.

6. As per claims 14, 37 and 60, Huitema and Belzile taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 61. Huitema further taught the step of establishing communicative coupling between a client web browser and a DNS server (page 1, lines 26-29).

7. As per claims 15-17, 38-40 and 61-63, Huitema and Belzile taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 61. Huitema further taught that wherein the computer network comprises the Internet, an IP based computer network and an intranet (300, fig.3, page 1, lines 19-21, page 4, lines 13-17).

8. As per claims 18, 41 and 64, Huitema and Belzile taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 61. Huitema further taught that a DNS server system receives the

request and the DNS server system comprises a DNS server appliance (fig.1, page 4, lines 13-19).

9. Claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Belzile as applied to claims 13, 36 and 61 above, and further in view of Frank et al (hereinafter Frank), US 6,832,120.

10. As per claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69, Huitema and Belzile taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 61. Huitema and Belzile did not specifically teach the system to further linking a host object with a network object and a zone object, the zone object is linked to another zone object, the network object is linked to another network object, unlinking an old network object from a host object; deleting the old network object; and linking the host object to a new network object and automatically updating the host object to reflect an association with the new network object. Frank taught that custom objects can be programmed and linked together to support applications (col.2, lines 6-15) and the links can be deleted, added or reconfigured in real time (col.5, lines 54-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Belzile and Frank because Frank's teaching of creating custom objects and linking objects enables Huitema and Belzile's system to use custom objects to support system applications.

11. Claims 1-3, 7-12, 24-26, 30-35, 47-49 and 53-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frese, II et al (hereinafter Frese), US 5,909,545, in view of Boden et al (hereinafter Boden), US 6,832,322.

12. As per claims 1, 24 and 47, Frese taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method of providing configuration access to a server system from a client in a computer network (col.3, lines 55-67, col.4, lines 1-4), the method comprising the steps of:

- a. A processor (user computer is known to comprise processors; col.6, lines 65-66) configured to:
- b. establishing communicative coupling between a client web browser and a server system web server (col.2, lines 27-47, col.4, lines 23-32, col.6, lines 65-67, col.7, line 1);
- c. requesting a user interface (col.2, lines 1-5, 37-45, col.4, lines 20-28), adapted to provide configuration access to a server system (col.3, lines 55-67, col.4, lines 1-4); and
- d. downloading the user interface from the server system over the computer network (col.1, lines 66-67, col.2, lines 1-5, col.4, lines 5-17); and
- e. a memory coupled with the processor, wherein the memory provides the processor with instructions (user computer is known to comprise memory for providing instructions).

13. Frese did not specifically teach that the server system is a DNS server system. However, Frese's teaching of using the remote controlling method can be applied to control servers such as DNS server. Boden taught to configure a DNS server system using a graphical user interface (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Frese and Boden because the Boden's teachings of using graphical user interface for controlling and configuring the DNS server enables Frese's system to access and configure the remote NDS servers to avoid redundant copies of information contained (Boden, col.7, lines 19-20).

14. As per claims 2-3, 25-26 and 48-49, Frese and Boden taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 24 and 47. Frese further taught that wherein the user interface comprises a GUI/JGUI (col.9, lines 13-18, 63-66, col.10, 14-16, 18-20).

15. As per claims 7, 11, 30, 34, 53 and 57, Frese and Boden taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 24 and 47. Frese further including the step of establishing communicative coupling between the client web browser/user interface and a configuration server of the DNS server system (col.2, lines 27-47, col.4, lines 23-32, col.6, lines 65-67, col.7, line 1).

16. As per claims 8-10, 31-33, 54-56, Frese and Boden taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 24 and 47. Frese further taught that wherein the computer network

comprises the Internet, an IP based computer network and an intranet (14, fig.1, col.2, lines 27-32, col.3, lines 28-29, col.7, lines 23-27).

17. As per claims 12, 35 and 58, Frese and Boden taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 24 and 47. Boden further taught that the DNS server system comprises a DNS server appliance (col.6, lines 64-67, col.7, lines 19-42).

18. Claims 4-6, 27-29 and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frese and Boden as applied to claims 1, 24 and 47 above, and further in view of “Official Notice”.

19. As per claims 4-6, 27-29 and 50-52, Frese and Boden taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 24 and 47. Boden further taught that the user interface is adapted to provide configuration access and access DNS database (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). Frese and Boden did not specifically teach that the configuration access is to an object oriented database/DNS object oriented database. However, Official Notice is taken that accessing an object oriented database is well known and expected in the art. One would have been motivated to access and object oriented database to perform update and management work (e.g. administrator). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Frese and Boden and further enables access and configuration to DNS object oriented database to perform management and update procedures.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Waters, US 6,564,216.

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl

April 1, 2005